

DELTA STATE UNIVERSITY: ACADEMIC ANNUAL REPORT
Academic Year 2005-06

Unit Title: Division of Teacher Education

School or College: College of Education

Unit Administrator: Leslie Griffin, Ed.D.

I. Educational Program Learning Outcome Assessment Plan:

These are Learner Outcomes identified for the **current** year.

Bachelor of Science in Elementary Education Degree Program

| <p>Learning Outcome <i>What should a graduate in this major know, value, or be able to do at graduation and beyond?</i></p> | <p>Data Collection and Analysis <i>What assessment tools and/or methods will you use to determine achievement of the learning outcome? Describe how the data from these tools and/or methods will be collected. Explain the procedure to analyze the data.</i></p> | <p>Results of Evaluation <i>What were the findings of the analysis? List any specific recommendations.</i></p> | <p>Use of Evaluation Results <i>What changes in curriculum, courses, or procedures were made as a result of the program learning outcome assessment process?</i></p> |
|--|--|---|--|
| <p>Demonstrate mastery of the knowledge and skills associated with both the content and pedagogy of the undergraduate degree program in elementary education</p> | <p><i>College BASE</i>, a criterion-referenced academic achievement exam (covering mathematics, social studies, science, and English) will be piloted in spring 2006 in CEL 301, <i>Introduction to Education</i>, as a measure of students' content knowledge. An institutional summary, as well as individual score reports, will provide data.</p> <p>Institutional reports and individual score reports for <i>PRAXIS II Content: Elementary Education: Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment, K-5</i>, taken by all candidates prior to admission to student teaching, will be analyzed in the aggregate to determine strengths and weaknesses in candidates' knowledge of content and pedagogy in the field.</p> | <p>Score reports for the spring 2006 administration of <i>College BASE</i> will be available June 2006.</p> <p>Faculty reviewed <i>PRAXIS II Content</i> test data for spring 2006 student teachers during a retreat and found that most candidates scored within the average range when compared with a national norm group. More students scored in the above average range on the content portion of the <i>PRAXIS</i> than on the <i>PRAXIS II: Principles of Learning and Teaching</i>. In general, a slightly greater percentage of candidates scored at the below average range than at the above average range.</p> | <p>Test results will be used to establish cut scores and to make a decision as to whether <i>College BASE</i> is a reasonable measure of content for students in the program. A decision will be made as to whether a minimum score on <i>College BASE</i> will be required for entry into teacher education, or the test should be used for advisement purposes (or both). Faculty members determined that students scored fairly well on the <i>PRAXIS II Content</i> test in comparison to national norm groups, noting that ACT scores of some candidates indicate that scholarship is not a strength. In an effort to strengthen emphasis on content in the program, the faculty required students in CEL 317, <i>Principles and Techniques of Teaching in Early Childhood</i>, and CEL 318, <i>Principles and Techniques of Teaching in the Middle Grades</i>, to plan an integrated unit comprised of lessons in all content areas. A</p> |

| | | | |
|--|---|---|---|
| | | | faculty committee also contacted all content area methods instructors in an effort to coordinate best practice strategies in the respective content areas. |
| Demonstrate the ability to plan and implement instruction for diverse populations in the elementary school setting that reflects <i>Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (INTASC) Standards</i> ¹ | Candidates will plan instruction for and teach diverse populations during field experiences in CEL 317, <i>Principles and Techniques of Teaching in Early Childhood</i> , and CEL 318, <i>Principles and Techniques of Teaching in the Middle Grades</i> , as well as in the student teaching clinical experience. The <i>STAI (Student Teacher Assessment Instrument)</i> will be used to collect data on candidates' performance. The <i>STAI</i> , cross-referenced to <i>Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (INTASC) Standards</i> , is an instrument used statewide to measure teacher candidates' abilities within the following domains: planning and preparation; communication and interaction; teaching and learning; managing the learning environment; assessment of student learning; and professionalism and partnerships. The <i>Teacher Work Sample (TWS)</i> will be used during the | All candidates evaluated in field and clinical experiences scored at the acceptable or outstanding level on final evaluations using the <i>Student Teacher Assessment Instrument (STAI)</i> during the fall 2005 and spring 2006 semesters. While overall scores were at the acceptable or outstanding level, a small percentage of candidates in field experiences did not score as highly on indicators dealing with problem solving, critical thinking, and the use of a variety of strategies. These have been recurring themes for the past several years. Similarly, all candidates in field and clinical experiences scored at the acceptable or outstanding level on final evaluations of the <i>Teacher Work Sample</i> . The assessment committee found that the | Based on results from evaluations of field experiences in CEL 317/CEL 318, faculty members have made plans to incorporate more opportunities for problem solving, critical thinking, and planning/teaching using varied methods throughout courses across the program. Teacher work sample was well received and components will |

| | | | |
|--|---|--|--|
| | <p>student teaching clinical experience to assess candidates' knowledge, skills, and dispositions related to best practice/reflective thought with respect to a candidate's ability to plan and implement instruction for a range of learners with varying needs. The components include contextual factors associated with learning; the development of learning goals; an assessment plan; a design for instruction; evidence of instructional decision making; analysis of student learning; reflection and evaluation; a specific design for instruction incorporating content areas within elementary education; and a research-based component for scientific practice. Each component has an associated rubric for assessment.</p> | <p>overall quality of reflections on the <i>Teacher Work Sample</i> improved from fall 2005 to spring 2006. The Teacher Work Sample replaces the STAI questionnaire which had been used for many years in an effort to prompt candidates to reflect upon their teaching. It was found to be ineffectual.</p> | <p>be further infused throughout the elementary education program. Exemplars and range products were made available to candidates during the spring 2006 semester and will continue to be made available to candidates in 2006-07.</p> |
| <p>Demonstrate ability to measure impact on student learning in the elementary school setting based on assessment data</p> | <p>The <i>Teacher Work Sample (TWS)</i> will be used during the student teaching clinical experience to assess candidates' knowledge, skills, and dispositions related to best practice/reflective thought with respect to candidate impact on student learning, specifically the component for reflection and evaluation, with its accompanying rubric.</p> | <p>All candidates scored at the acceptable or outstanding level on the <i>Teacher Work Sample</i> rubrics. Candidates revealed a strong ability to analyze test data in terms of pre- and post-test gains/losses, but a lesser (though acceptable) ability to reflect upon the implications of the data. [Students were given feedback by supervisors as they developed their work sample,</p> | <p>Faculty members found the <i>Teacher Work Sample</i> to be a strong methodology for helping students to focus and reflect upon their instruction, with much transfer to actual teaching. They did, however, find that candidates still need growth opportunities for reflection and, therefore, plan to incorporate more case studies/field experiences</p> |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|--|
| | | <p>allowing them to improve their scores across the experience.] While candidates had in the past administered pre- and post-tests within their STAI units, they often neglected to reflect upon the results in a systematic manner that impacted their teaching in a significant manner. The <i>Teacher Work Sample</i> addresses this deficiency.</p> | <p>requiring a reflective component throughout the program.</p> |
| <p>Demonstrate ability to plan and implement instruction in the elementary school through a collaborative network</p> | <p>Candidates in CEL 317, <i>Principles and Techniques for Teaching in the Primary Grades</i>, and CEL 318, <i>Principles and Techniques for Teaching in the Middle Grades</i>, planned and taught integrated units covering all content areas through collaborative group work in spring 2006. A scoring guide was used to assess collaborative planning and teaching.</p> | <p>Aggregated scores for integrated units in CEL 317 and CEL 318 revealed that all candidates successfully collaborated to plan and teach an integrated unit in the field during the spring 2006 semester. The unit requirements were re-evaluated for the 2005-06 term. Candidates have successfully completed integrated units for the past eight years, but an increased effort was made to incorporate all content areas within the unit and provide a broader range of experiences for candidates.</p> | <p>Faculty members were quite pleased with the results of the integrated unit planning/teaching experiences in CEL 317/CEL 318. The faculty had undertaken a challenging task in requiring that all subject areas be integrated within the unit, requiring candidates to collaborate with multiple entities while planning. They found that the experience was successful and beneficial, and, therefore, plan to continue the practice.</p> |
| <p>Exhibit dispositions associated with successful teaching in the elementary school</p> | <p>The <i>College of Education Dispositions Rating Scale (correlated with the Student Teacher Assessment Instrument)</i> will be used to assess students' dispositions in</p> | <p>Faculty and clinical supervisors assessed student/candidate dispositions in CEL 301, <i>Introduction to Teaching</i> and CEL 496, <i>Directed Teaching</i>, as well as in courses and</p> | <p>Faculty members were pleased with the results of the overall disposition assessment system, with use of the <i>Dispositions Rating Scale</i> central to the system. A comprehensive effort</p> |

| | | | |
|--|--|--|--|
| | <p>CEL 301, <i>Introduction to Teaching</i>, and CEL 496, <i>Directed Teaching</i>. The scale will also be used to assess individual candidates' progress toward exhibiting the dispositions throughout the program. The Scale contains 15 dispositions and associated indicators correlated with effective teaching research.</p> | <p>experiences across the elementary education program and conferenced individually with students/candidates regarding the assessments during the fall 2005 and spring 2006 semesters. Overall, they found that students and candidates have been more responsive to the development of their dispositions as a result of the increased emphasis on dispositions and related conferences. While students at initial and intermediate points in the program exhibited a range of development with regard to dispositions, candidates in student teaching exhibited acceptable and/or outstanding dispositions. In previous years, candidates were assessed on a number of dispositions prior to admittance into Teacher Education and Student Teaching. Approximately 5-10% of students/candidates required improvement plans prior to admittance, with approximately an additional 10-15% of students/candidates requiring conferences to address weaknesses. The new dispositions assessment plan targets students earlier in the program and in a more systematic fashion with the</p> | <p>was made to teach and assess appropriate dispositions during the fall 2005 and spring 2006 semesters. These efforts will be duplicated and enhanced in 2006-2007, with increased focus in faculty study groups on how students rate in the aggregate on individual indicators, as well as how their self-assessments compare with the assessments of faculty/supervisors, in an effort to pinpoint strategies for enhancing dispositions. The disparity between beginning students' scores and candidates' scores at the exit point indicate that dispositions can and do change with experiences, and, therefore, may be influenced throughout the elementary education program.</p> |
|--|--|--|--|

| | | | |
|--|--|---|--|
| | | hopes of fostering appropriate dispositions prior to students/candidates being admitted to Teacher Education/Student Teaching. Of course, some dispositions are most appropriately developed during the latter stages of the program. | |
|--|--|---|--|

¹The Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (INTASC) Standards were developed by the Council of Chief State School Officers and member states to guide teacher preparation programs.

Master of Education in Elementary Education Degree Program

| <p>Learning Outcome <i>What should a graduate in this major know, value, or be able to do at graduation and beyond?</i></p> | <p>Data Collection and Analysis <i>What assessment tools and/or methods will you use to determine achievement of the learning outcome? Describe how the data from these tools and/or methods will be collected. Explain the procedure to analyze the data.</i></p> | <p>Results of Evaluation <i>What were the findings of the analysis? List any specific recommendations.</i></p> | <p>Use of Evaluation Results <i>What changes in curriculum, courses, or procedures were made as a result of the program learning outcome assessment process?</i></p> |
|---|---|---|--|
| <p>Demonstrate understanding of knowledge and skills associated with the content of the M. Ed. degree program in elementary education</p> | <p>A comprehensive examination will be administered each semester to candidates in the final courses of the M.Ed. A rubric will be used to evaluate the exams. Distribution of scores will be analyzed to assess strengths and weaknesses in the program.</p> | <p>Data showed that the majority of students enrolled in the program acquired the knowledge and skills associated with its content. A small percentage (approximately 1 out of 15) of students failed to pass all portions of the exam. This pattern has been constant for the past three to five years. Program advisors reviewed inadequate responses in light of the course content and recommended that faculty meet with individual candidates for remediation. In addition, candidates evidenced a need for improved composition and organization skills associated with advanced elementary education study, to be addressed through conferences and referrals to writing tutorials.</p> | <p>The M.Ed. program has been revamped to streamline and focus its content so that candidates will master essential knowledge and skills. Proposed curriculum changes have been approved and are being implemented. Conferences were held with candidates exhibiting writing deficiencies, and referrals were made to the writing tutorials in the Technology Lab.</p> |
| <p>Demonstrate skill in planning</p> | <p>In CEL 610, <i>Effective</i></p> | <p>Formative assessment showed</p> | <p>Individual conferences were</p> |

| | | | |
|--|---|--|---|
| <p>for diverse populations in the elementary school, while exhibiting appropriate dispositions for effective teaching at the master's level</p> | <p>required to plan and teach a lesson plan in an approved school setting. A rubric will be used to assess planning, management, implementation, and dispositions. In CEL 630, <i>Practicum in Elementary Education</i>, candidates will be required to plan and implement a teaching unit. A rubric will be used to assess their planning/teaching and related dispositions. A distribution of the scores on rubrics will be used to analyze data.</p> | <p>help in planning and teaching lessons commensurate with an advanced level of understanding. Faculty members recommend that specific feedback be provided on an individualized basis and that a more specific and detailed rubric be developed for use in CEL 630, <i>Practicum in Elementary Education</i>, where clinical practice occurs.</p> | <p>throughout CEL 610, <i>Effective Instruction</i>, to guide their planning and implementation. School supervisors were identified to serve in a coaching capacity in the field. A more detailed planning rubric was developed for use in CEL 630, <i>Practicum in Elementary Education</i>, to reinforce skills. Conferences were held with students to discuss dispositions and plan strategies to overcome weaknesses.</p> <p>NOTE: CEL 630 is taught Summer I, so data associated with that course will be available at the end of Summer I, 2006. Prior data is not available, as this is a new assessment.</p> |
| <p>Demonstrate the ability to assess student learning and create appropriate learning opportunities at both lower and upper elementary grade levels through reflective practices associated with master teachers</p> | <p>Teaching units will be used in CEL 630, <i>Practicum in Elementary Education</i>, during summer 2005. A clinical feedback form will be used to determine candidates' abilities to assess student learning and plan/adapt instruction based on assessment results. Related dispositions will be assessed using the feedback form as well. The instructor and program coordinator will review the data to make</p> | <p>An analysis of scores received on clinical feedback forms indicated that a significant number of candidates needed additional strategies for working with students at all levels of elementary education. A strength identified was the ability of candidates to make practical application of theory, but weaknesses prevailed in teaching content at grade levels to which candidates were not assigned in the field.</p> | <p>Clinical faculty members from the teaching field were identified to serve as models for candidates in the M.Ed. program in elementary education. Graduate faculty have met to identify strategies for ensuring that exposure to best practices at all grade levels in the elementary school be incorporated into coursework. Course syllabi are under revision and are to reflect this increased emphasis.</p> |

| | | | |
|--|--|---|--|
| | <p>necessary program/curriculum modifications.</p> <p>NOTE: The curriculum team desired to make changes to the data collection/evaluation procedures that would not be achievable by Summer II, 2005. Therefore, two procedures are identified. The <i>Teacher Work Sample</i> will replace the previously outlined procedures beginning Summer I, 2006.</p> <p>The <i>Teacher Work Sample (TWS)</i> will be used in CEL 630, <i>Practicum in Elementary Education</i>, during Summer I 2006 to assess candidates' knowledge, skills, and dispositions related to best practice/reflective thought with respect to candidate impact on student learning. The <i>TWS</i> has eight components, each assessed with an individual rubric. The components include contextual factors associated with learning; the development of learning goals; an assessment plan; a design for instruction; evidence of instructional decision-making; analysis of student learning; reflection and evaluation; a specific design for instruction incorporating content areas within elementary education;</p> | <p>A recommendation was that additional modeling of teaching strategies at all grade levels in clinical settings be added to the curriculum across the M.Ed. program.</p> | |
|--|--|---|--|

Educational Specialist in Elementary Education Degree Program

| | | | |
|--|--|--|---|
| | and a research-based component for scientific practice. | | |
| Demonstrate advanced proficiency in the use of technology in teaching in the elementary school | During ELR 605, <i>Educational Research and Statistics</i> , candidates' proficiency in technology applications (word processing, spreadsheets, presentations, and telecommunications) will be assessed in the Technology Lab in the College of Education. Scores will be analyzed by an assessment team to determine strengths/weaknesses. Data will also be collected in individual courses on specific instructional technology competencies. A curriculum team will review performance data on these competencies and make recommendations. The COE made a decision to place the tech. exam in ELR 605 in order to reach all candidates. | The passing rate on the technology proficiency examination was approximately 95 percent. A review of individual performance related to course competencies indicated that specific tutorials would be helpful to some candidates. A recommendation is that referrals be made on an individual basis by course instructors. Further, it is recommended that in courses where field teaching/clinical practice occurs, instructional technology be evidenced in planning and teaching. | Conferences were held to refer candidates to appropriate tutorials throughout courses in the program. Course syllabi for CEL 610, <i>Effective Instruction</i> , and CEL 630, <i>Practicum in Elementary Education</i> , were revised to more clearly indicate how technology is to be infused throughout teaching. |

| | | | |
|---|---|--|--|
| <p>Learning Outcome <i>What should a graduate in this major know, value, or be able to do at graduation and beyond?</i></p> | <p>Data Collection and Analysis <i>What assessment tools and/or methods will you use to determine achievement of the learning outcome? Describe how the data from these tools and/or methods will be collected. Explain the procedure</i></p> | <p>Results of Evaluation <i>What were the findings of the analysis? List any specific recommendations.</i></p> | <p>Use of Evaluation Results <i>What changes in curriculum, courses, or procedures were made as a result of the program learning outcome assessment process?</i></p> |
|---|---|--|--|

| | | | |
|--|--|---|---|
| | <i>to analyze the data.</i> | | |
| Demonstrate ability to conduct and utilize scientific and action research related to best practices in elementary education at the specialist's level | Students in the Ed. S. program will conduct scientific and action research related to best practices in the elementary school through an action research module assignment in both CEL 705, <i>Practicum in Early Childhood Education</i> , and CEL 706, <i>Practicum in Upper Elementary Middle School</i> . A rubric will be used to assess the modules. | Data showed that candidates in CEL 705 (fall 2005) and CEL 706 (fall 2006) generally were able to conduct basic research related to best practices and gained much needed information from doing so. 100% of students enrolled in the practicum courses successfully completed the module. Their weakest scores were in organization of research and results. This has been a recurring pattern for the past three years. | The information obtained from the rubrics will be used to refine and further develop the research projects in the courses under consideration. This is necessary since best practices are always in a state of revision. Specifically, more detailed directions will be developed to accompany the rubric to improve candidates' organization skills. |
| Demonstrate understanding of knowledge and skills associated with the content of the Ed.S. degree program in elementary education | A comprehensive examination will be administered each semester to candidates in the final courses of the Ed.S. A rubric will be used to evaluate the exams. Distribution of scores will be analyzed to assess strengths and weaknesses in the program | Data showed that the majority of students enrolled in the program acquired the knowledge and skills associated with the content. There was a 100% pass rate on the examination, with no retakes. This pass rate has been constant for the past five years. | The Ed.S. program is evaluated in light of the information obtained from the analysis of the comprehensive examination. No recent changes have been made, but the faculty carefully considers changes in light of the data collected. |
| Demonstrate the ability to plan and implement innovations in elementary teaching emanating from research-based practices and reflective of National Professional Teaching Board Standards (NPTBS) ² | Assignments in CEL 705, <i>Practicum in Early Childhood Education</i> , and CEL 706, <i>Practicum in Upper Elementary Middle School</i> , are reflective of <i>National Professional Teaching Board Standards (NPTBS)</i> . Candidates' will be required to | Data showed that generally students were able to plan and implement lessons effectively in accordance with the <i>National Professional Teaching Board Standards</i> . A 100% pass rate on the teaching assignment was achieved during the fall 2005 and spring | Graduate faculty members teaching courses and supervising practicum experiences at the specialist's level will make stronger connections to <i>National Professional Teaching Board Standards (NPTBS)</i> in course content. Course syllabi were |

| | | | |
|--|--|---|---|
| | <p>plan and teach a unit correlated with <i>National Professional Teaching Board Standards</i>. The assignment will be assessed through a rubric developed by graduate faculty. In addition, candidates will be required to complete a correlated <i>Teacher Work Sample (TWS)</i>, a reflective study of their teaching and its impact, to include the following components: contextual factors associated with learning; learning goals; an assessment plan; a design for instruction; an analysis of student learning; reflection and evaluation; a specific design for instruction incorporating content areas within elementary education; and a research-based component for scientific practice (related to <i>NPTBS</i>). Each component has a related rubric.</p> | <p>2006 semesters. Review of the data revealed that candidates need greater skill in associating their classroom practices with <i>National Professional Teaching Board Standards</i>. This was the first year that <i>NPTBS Standards</i> have been emphasized consistently.</p> | <p>revised to reflect <i>NPTBS</i>.</p> |
| <p>Demonstrate skill in planning and implementing instruction for diverse populations, while exhibiting appropriate dispositions for teaching at a specialized level</p> | <p>During spring 2006, in CEL 706, <i>Practicum for the Intermediate Grades</i>, candidates will be required to plan and teach a unit in an approved school setting. A <i>Teacher Work Sample</i> will be completed in conjunction with the unit. Related rubrics will be used to assess planning, teaching, and dispositions. A distribution of the scores on rubrics will be used to analyze</p> | <p>An analysis of scores on the teaching unit and related <i>Teacher Work Sample</i> completed in CEL 706 in spring 2006 revealed that candidates generally worked well with students at all levels of elementary education. A strength identified was the ability of candidates to make practical application of theory. Two of three candidates in CEL 706, <i>Practicum in Upper</i></p> | <p>Graduate faculty have met to identify strategies for ensuring that exposure to best practices at all grade levels in the elementary school be incorporated into coursework. As specialist level syllabi are revised, an increased emphasis will be placed on helping candidates make research-based connections to classroom practice.</p> |

| | | | |
|--|-------|---|--|
| | data. | <i>Elementary Middle School Education</i> , showed weaknesses in connecting classroom teaching practices to scientific research via <i>National Professional Teaching Board Standards</i> . | |
|--|-------|---|--|

²The National Board for Professional Teaching Standards was established in 1987 to set high and rigorous standards for what accomplished teachers should know and be able to do. It is governed by a board of directors comprised of classroom teachers, school administrators, legislators and others from a cross-section of community, business, and government sectors.

Master of Arts in Teaching Degree Program

| | | | |
|--|---|---|---|
| <p>Learning Outcome <i>What should a graduate in this major know, value, or be able to do at graduation and beyond?</i></p> | <p>Data Collection and Analysis <i>What assessment tools and/or methods will you use to determine achievement of the learning outcome? Describe how the data from these tools and/or methods will be collected. Explain the procedure to analyze the data.</i></p> | <p>Results of Evaluation <i>What were the findings of the analysis? List any specific recommendations.</i></p> | <p>Use of Evaluation Results <i>What changes in curriculum, courses, or procedures were made as a result of the program learning outcome assessment process?</i></p> |
|--|---|---|---|

| | | | |
|--|---|--|--|
| <p>Demonstrate proficiency in basic pre-professional and content knowledge the Mississippi Department of Education requires for Alternate - Route Teacher Education candidates through the Master of Arts in Teaching degree program</p> | <p>Data will be collected prior to program admission through scores on <i>PRAXIS I Pre-Professional Skills Assessment (PPST)</i>, a measure of basic skills in reading, writing, and mathematics, and <i>PRAXIS II: Subject Assessments</i>, measures of specific subjects that K-12 educators will teach, as well as general and subject-specific teaching skills and knowledge. The Master of Arts in Teaching (MAT) Committee will review scores and note trends.</p> | <p>All applicants admitted to the Master of Arts in Teaching (MAT) program have met or exceeded the Mississippi Department of Education’s minimum cut scores.</p> <p>The MAT is in its initial year of implementation, but a review of last year’s data showed the majority of applicants did not take the required <i>PRAXIS</i> examinations or make the minimum MDE <i>PRAXIS I</i> or <i>II</i> score.</p> | <p>The College of Education created within the Technology Lab a self-paced tutorial system, The Learning Curve, where applicants can prepare for <i>PRAXIS</i> tests using tutorials.</p> <p>A Master of Arts in Teaching brochure was created with resources for <i>PRAXIS</i> information.</p> <p>“Basic Skills Test Prep Course,” a <i>PRAXIS</i> preparation C-D Rom, has also been made available to applicants.</p> |
| <p>Demonstrate the ability to plan and implement instruction that meets the needs of diverse learners in the classroom setting</p> | <p>Initial data were collected on Master of Arts in Teaching candidates in CSD 632*, CEL/CUR 612*, and CEL/CSD 614* using instructor-created rubrics. University supervisors also collected data via a program – developed teacher evaluation form the first semester of CEL/CUR 650*, the year-long internship.</p> <p>However, in order to provide more substantial and standardized data, second semester University supervisors will implement the <i>Student Teacher Assessment Instrument (STAI)</i> and <i>Teacher</i></p> | <p>Methods instructors reported that a significant number of candidates had difficulty conceptualizing and developing long range, i.e., a unit plan or curriculum map.</p> <p>A review of first semester evaluation data showed candidates need continuing support in developing planning skills.</p> <p>A review of logs documenting collaboration with mentor teachers showed that candidates need more assistance in developing long range plans.</p> | <p>Course content will be restructured to introduce the <i>Teacher Work Sample</i> and the <i>STAI</i> earlier in courses throughout the program of study. <i>Teacher Work Samples</i> and the <i>STAI</i> will be implemented in CEL/CUR 650 in fall 2006. Specific content identified as weaknesses in a review of data will be emphasized throughout the program.</p> <p>The program coordinator will explore ways to strengthen the mentor component, especially as it relates to planning and implementing instruction.</p> |

| | | | |
|--|--|---|---|
| | <p><i>Work Sample (TWS)</i>, which will also be integrated into CEL/CUR 650 course content. The <i>STAI</i> is an instrument used statewide to measure teacher candidates' abilities within the following domains: planning and preparation; communication and interaction; teaching and learning; managing the learning environment; assessment of student learning; and professionalism and partnerships.</p> <p>The <i>TWS</i> assesses candidates' knowledge, skills, and dispositions related to best practice/reflective thought with respect to candidate impact on student learning. The components include contextual factors associated with learning; the development of learning goals; an assessment plan; a design for instruction; evidence of instructional decision making; analysis of student learning; and reflection and evaluation. The <i>Teacher Work Sample</i> and <i>STAI</i> are divided into components, assessed with individual rubrics, and aligned with instruments used at other universities.</p> | <p>Program supervisors and planners, in reviewing <i>STAI</i> and <i>TWS</i> data, determined that areas of strength for candidates were reflection and classroom management, while identifying state curriculum competencies and objectives, identifying contextual factors for learning, instructional planning, collaborative planning, and the use of cooperative grouping strategies with students were areas of weakness.</p> | <p>The program coordinator will collaborate with supervisors and Division Chair to adapt <i>Teacher Work Samples</i> and the <i>STAI</i> to the realities and constraints of the MAT program.</p> |
| <p>Demonstrate the ability to complete a successful field experience</p> | <p>The Master of Arts in Teaching Program is a year-long experience in the field. As</p> | <p>Qualitative data from candidates' reflection journals suggested that the majority felt</p> | <p>Quantitative data needs to be collected after the first four courses in order to determine</p> |

| | | | |
|---|---|--|---|
| | <p>such, instructors in CEL/CUR 611*, CEL/CUR 612 and CEL/CSD 614, as well as CSP 546*, (the four pre-teaching or summer courses) will use a variety of case studies, instructional strategies, and resources to help prepare candidates for the field. Data will be collected via journals candidates will keep during fall 2005 in CEL/CUR 650.</p> | <p>adequately prepared after the first four courses.</p> | <p>how well the pre-teaching courses prepare candidates for their clinical experiences and to ascertain areas of concern.</p> <p>A journal requiring candidates to reflect throughout their first semester of teaching experiences should be required, not optional.</p> |
| <p>Demonstrate the ability to measure student achievement, employ classroom management, and adjust instruction for maximum impact on student learning</p> | <p>First semester supervisors used a program-created evaluation form, but second semester they implemented the use of the <i>STAI</i> and <i>Teacher Work Sample</i>, which were also integrated into CEL/CUR 650 course content.</p> <p>Principals provided informal feedback through interviews to university supervisors during site visits. A more formal survey instrument is under development for use in year two.</p> | <p>A cursory data analysis suggests that a significant number of MAT interns need to become more skilled in using varied instructional strategies and resources.</p> <p>Data also showed that candidates need additional support in monitoring and adjusting instruction as well as managing the classroom environment.</p> <p>Approximately a fourth of the principals interviewed voiced concerns that MAT interns, like the rest of their staff, stress MCT preparation to the exclusion of all else.</p> | <p>CEL/CUR 650 content will be restructured around the teaching of the <i>STAI</i> and <i>Teacher Work Sample</i> at the beginning of the fall 2006 semester.</p> <p>University supervisors will examine and better understand their roles in supporting MAT candidates through feedback related to the <i>STAI</i> and <i>Teacher Work Sample</i>.</p> <p>The program coordinator will communicate and collaborate with principals as well as MCT consultants in order to help candidates maximize their impact on student learning.</p> |

| | | | |
|---|---|--|---|
| <p>Demonstrate a commitment to the teaching profession and to lifelong learning as evidenced by reflection, collaboration, and a commitment to professional development</p> | <p>The <i>College of Education Dispositions Rating Scale (Domain VI of the Student Teacher Assessment Instrument: Professionalism and Partnerships)</i> will be used to assess candidates' professional dispositions. The rating scale contains 12 indicators dealing with the candidate's ability to exhibit professional behaviors associated with effective teaching and collaborate with educational partners. The quantitative data will be collected in CEL/CUR 650 during spring 2006. A <i>teaching philosophy</i> will also be collected from each student as a measure of professional dispositions during the fall 2005 and spring 2006 semesters. A rubric will be used to evaluate these assignments.</p> <p>Qualitative data will be provided through candidates sharing reflective journals and anecdotes of their activities.</p> | <p>The instructor reviewed the dispositions and philosophies, as well as qualitative data, with each candidate and shared concerns, questions and comments. Instructors recommended that these be reviewed early in the internship so that candidates could make needed improvements/capitalize on strengths. They should be revisited throughout the internship and resubmitted for review at the end of the experience. There was a wide range in the responses, underscoring the need to address the status of each with candidates individually.</p> | <p>Internship instructors/supervisors will review candidate dispositions/philosophies at the onset of the fall 2006 internship and use them as points of conversation throughout the clinical visits, culminating in a second assessment of candidates' dispositions/philosophies at the end of the internship in spring 2006 in order to note changes over the course of the academic year.</p> <p>The program coordinator will explore ways to document candidates' professionalism as reflected through their philosophies and dispositions, and documented by activities as varied as attending workshops, reading journals, and supporting co-curriculum activities at their respective schools.</p> |
| <p>Demonstrate a commitment to diversity by working with diverse candidates, faculty, and students in various settings</p> | <p>Quantitative data will be collected using the <i>Openness to Diversity and Challenge Survey</i> (Pascarelli <i>et al</i>, 2004)³ spring 2006 semester near the end of the CEL/CUR 650 internship. The survey,</p> | <p>Initial data analysis suggested that the majority of candidates are open to the facets of diversity represented on the survey.</p> <p>Survey results and the</p> | <p>The survey needs to be implemented in CEL/CUR 650 at the beginning of the fall 2006 semester and followed up at the end of the CEL/CUR 650 spring 2007 semester, and supplemented with qualitative</p> |

| | | | |
|--|--|--|--|
| | <p>adopted by the College of Education, contains eight statements on a range of diversity stances, requiring candidates to assess their degree of comfort with the diversity issues using a Likert scale.</p> <p>After completing the survey, candidates will provide complementary qualitative data in which they will explain how (if) their ratings changed over the course of the year and reasons for changes or the lack thereof. The instructor will review survey results.</p> | <p>corresponding qualitative statements will continue to be reviewed. Trends in responses to the eight-item survey will be noted and used to plan experiences that will promote respect for diversity issues within the program.</p> | <p>data.</p> <p>Opportunities for diverse candidates, students, and faculty to work together will be structured throughout the MAT program.</p> <p>The bibliography for course syllabi will be revised to include diverse scholars who represent different perspectives on pedagogy.</p> |
| <p>Demonstrate proficiency in the use of technology as a tool to enhance teaching and learning</p> | <p>Candidates take CML 509*, a distance learning course that focuses on the use of technology in the school setting and culminates with the <i>COE Technology Assessment</i>. The <i>Technology Assessment</i> is a self-paced exam consisting of the following four sections: word processing, spreadsheets, presentations, and telecommunications.</p> <p>The <i>Technology Assessment</i> is also administered in ELR 605* in the Technology Lab in the College of Education. All other courses in the MAT program require candidates to demonstrate varying degrees of</p> | <p>The <i>Technology Assessment</i> was administered for the first time in spring 2006. A review of selected candidates' performance to date indicated that some will need individual tutorials.</p> | <p>The results of the <i>Technology Assessment</i> and performance on individual course outcomes will be used to direct students to tutorials available in the College of Education Technology Lab.</p> |

| | | | |
|--|--|--|--|
| | proficiency in instructional technology. | | |
|--|--|--|--|

* The following titles are provided for referenced courses.

CML 509 – Technology in Education

CSP 546 – Advanced Survey of Exceptional Children

CEL/CUR 611 – Classroom Management and Organization

CEL/CUR 612 – Development, Assessment, and Evaluation

CEL/CSD 614 – Methods of Instruction in Elementary/Secondary Schools

CSD 632 – Secondary Curriculum Planning, Theory, Organization and Development

CEL/CUR 650 – Dimensions of Learning/Internship

ELR 605 – Methods of Educational Research and Statistics

³Pascarella, E. T., Pierson, C. T., Wolniak, G. C., & Terenzini, P. T. (2004). First-generation college students: Additional evidence on college experiences and outcomes. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 75, 249 – 284.

Bachelor of Science in Special Education Degree Program

| <p>Learning Outcome <i>What should a graduate in this major know, value, or be able to do at graduation and beyond?</i></p> | <p>Data Collection and Analysis <i>What assessment tools and/or methods will you use to determine achievement of the learning outcome? Describe how the data from these tools and/or methods will be collected. Explain the procedure to analyze the data.</i></p> | <p>Results of Evaluation <i>What were the findings of the analysis? List any specific recommendations.</i></p> | <p>Use of Evaluation Results <i>What changes in curriculum, courses, or procedures were made as a result of the program learning outcome assessment process?</i></p> |
|--|---|---|---|
| <p>Demonstrate mastery of the</p> | <p>Data will be collected at</p> | <p>Fall 2005 data were collected</p> | <p>Additional course content is</p> |

| | | | |
|---|---|--|--|
| <p>content of the special education undergraduate degree program including, but not limited to history, philosophy, theories, legal and ethical practices, service delivery, curriculum and instruction</p> | <p>admission to student teaching through <i>PRAXIS I: Pre-Professional Skills Assessment</i>, <i>PRAXIS Principles of Learning and Teaching</i>, and <i>PRAXIS II Specialty Area: Education of Exceptional Students: Core Content Knowledge</i>. Data will be collected at the end of the program through an electronic folio which addresses all 10 standards of the <i>Council for Exceptional Children (CEC)</i>, the special education accrediting body. The curriculum committee will review trends in data.</p> | <p>through traditional portfolios. Transition to electronic portfolios was begun in spring 2006. Preliminary data from the electronic portfolio trends suggested that candidate knowledge of legal and ethical practices and of cultural diversity was shallow. The committee suggested that additional course content was needed to boost these areas.</p> <p>Although portfolios were used in previous semesters, they were in a different format and results are difficult to compare. Portfolio responses in previous years were lacking in detail and hard to quantify. The new format uses more specific questions to elicit the information missing in previous portfolio attempts.</p> | <p>being added to CSP 348* and CSP 344* to enhance these content areas. Each revised syllabus will have specific diversity statements with outcomes. CSP 344 will include a component on ethical issues related to the CEC Code of Ethics.</p> |
| <p>Demonstrate the skills to plan and implement instruction for individuals with exceptional learning needs in a variety of classroom settings</p> | <p>Data will be collected in methods classes (CSP 387*, 347*, 386*, 496*) in the form of lesson plans, unit plans, and observations. Each will be evaluated with a rubric. Methods instructors will evaluate trends in observations.</p> | <p>Methods instructors in the fall 2005 semester reported that while candidates demonstrated an ability to plan sequentially and adapt instruction, they were weak in the creative use of activities and materials to enhance instruction. These results were consistent with those from student teachers in the last few years as training shifted to standards based teaching in elementary</p> | <p>The instructor in CSP 388 added hands on “make and take” sessions to help candidates expand their abilities to create materials to motivate student.</p> |

| | | | |
|--|---|--|---|
| | | <p>classrooms. The committee suggested that emphasis in CSP 388* (a course only offered in the spring) be shifted to include a focus on teacher made and adapted materials. The lesson plans and units developed later in the spring 2006 semester showed improvement in the variety of materials and methods employed as measured in observations and lesson plan review.</p> | |
| <p>Demonstrate the skills to measure student achievement and adjust instruction for maximum impact on student achievement through special education services</p> | <p>Data will be collected in CSP 345, <i>Curriculum Based Assessment</i>, and in field based methods classes (CSP 347, 387, 386, and 496). In each class, candidates will assess students; plan instruction based on the assessment; measure outcomes of instruction; and adjust instruction based on outcome assessment. Data will be collected from lesson plans and reflections. Each will be evaluated with a rubric. Methods instructors will evaluate trends from submitted lesson plans and structured observations.</p> | <p>Methods instructors reported inconsistent application of assessment in lesson plans. Cooperating teachers in the field are less rigorous in daily assessment and do not monitor this as closely as they do other elements of teaching. For several years, candidates have reported that field supervisors do not engage in daily assessment of specific skills, nor do they assess individual lesson plans. The curriculum committee members are committed to the idea that novice teachers must assess daily to ensure outcomes. The committee suggested that university supervisors monitor these practices carefully and give frequent feedback.</p> | <p>Field supervisors are conferencing about how to best improve practice.</p> |

| | | | |
|--|---|--|---|
| <p>Demonstrate the candidate's commitment to the special education profession and to lifelong learning by documenting participation in professional development activities</p> | <p>Data will be collected in CSP 348, CSP 388, and CSP 386, each of which has professional development as a course requirement. In each course, candidates must document the number of hours and types of experiences engaged in for professional development, and reflect on experiences. In CSP 386, candidates must set professional goals and track progress toward these goals. Instructors will report to the curriculum committee on the variety and quality of professional development activities.</p> | <p>Methods instructors reported an increase in the number and kinds of professional development activities in which students were engaged. In previous years, professional development activities tended to be limited to club meetings and professional development available on campus. This year, in addition to local options, professional development activities included a national conference and two special events in the disability community in Greenville. The committee noted that this trend is a result of instructors proactively seeking opportunities and making these known to the candidates. In previous years</p> | <p>Instructors continue to seek opportunities to provide a variety of professional experiences.</p> |
|--|---|--|---|

*The following titles are provided for referenced courses.

- CSP 344 – Assessment of Students with Special Needs
- CSP 347 – Special Education Practicum
- CSP 348 – Collaborative Partnerships in Special Education
- CSP 386 – Special Education Practices and Procedures
- CSP 387 – Secondary Level Methods and Practicum in Special Education
- CSP 388 – Education of the Elementary Level Mild/Moderate Disabled Student
- CSP 496 – Directed Teaching in Special Education

| <p>Learning Outcome <i>What should a graduate in this major know, value, or be able to do at graduation and beyond?</i></p> | <p>Data Collection and Analysis <i>What assessment tools and/or methods will you use to determine achievement of the learning outcome? Describe how the data from these tools and/or methods will be collected. Explain the procedure to analyze the data.</i></p> | <p>Results of Evaluation <i>What were the findings of the analysis? List any specific recommendations.</i></p> | <p>Use of Evaluation Results <i>What changes in curriculum, courses, or procedures were made as a result of the program learning outcome assessment process?</i></p> |
|--|---|--|--|
| <p>Demonstrate mastery of the content of the M.Ed. degree program in special education, including, but not limited to history, philosophy, theories, legal and ethical practices, service delivery, curriculum and instruction</p> | <p>Data will be collected at the end of the program through an electronic folio which addresses all 10 standards of the <i>Council for Exceptional Children (CEC)</i>, the special education accrediting body. Data will also be collected on the results of the comprehensive exams at the end of the program. The curriculum committee will review trends in data.</p> <p>Content mastery will be also measured through the <i>PRAXIS Specialty Area: Education of Exceptional Student: Core Knowledge</i>.</p> | <p>Comprehensive exams given Summer II 2005 and Fall 2005 showed mixed results. While most candidates had overall strong performance, 3 out of 11 candidates did not pass. Weaknesses were in the area of content depth and quality of writing. Candidates taking spring 2006 comprehensive exams were the 3 candidates retaking the exams. This is a shift from a trend of a 100% passing rate for several years. We feel this is in part caused by a change in the preparation of our candidates before entering the program. In the past, most candidates had undergraduate degrees in education or a minor in special education in their undergraduate degrees. Now many candidates enter the program with no background in education. The electronic portfolio is being field tested; preliminary</p> | <p>Faculty members are developing a pre-comprehensive exam system to add a requirement to take and pass formative comprehensive examination exercises in targeted classes.</p> |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | <p>submissions suggested that the portfolio will allow faculty to better measure content depth and breadth. Initial results are inconclusive. Candidates were not required to complete the entire portfolio. The parts of each section completed showed a more detailed application of principles than were seen in previous versions of the portfolio.</p> <p>All candidates taking the <i>PRAXIS Specialty Area</i> test in special education passed.</p> | |
| <p>Demonstrate skills associated with the master's level in special education in planning and implementing instruction for individuals with exceptional learning needs in a variety of classroom settings</p> | <p>Data will be collected in methods classes (CSP 643, 686, 547, 647) in the form of lesson plans and observations. Each will be evaluated with a rubric. Methods instructors will evaluate trends in observations.</p> | <p>Methods instructors in the fall 2005 semester reported that while candidates demonstrated an ability to plan instruction, they were weak in sequencing and adapting instruction. They were also weak in the creative use of activities and materials to enhance instruction. The faculty members recognize a need to enhance the field experience and instructional planning components in CSP 643 and 686. The lesson plans in spring 2006 semester internships and practicum showed a lack of consistency in application.</p> <p>Again, this points to the lack of preparation of candidates coming into the program. In</p> | <p>Faculty members are reworking practicum and field experience components in CSP 643, 686, 547 and 647 to build in more accountability, more varied experiences, and a better feedback loop.</p> |

| | | | |
|---|--|--|---|
| | | <p>previous years, an assumption was made that candidates had at least a passing knowledge of lesson planning and classroom organization, and the coursework was designed to enhance this knowledge. It was also assumed that most, if not all, candidates were employed in classrooms. Increasingly, candidates do not have a background in education and are not employed in the classroom. This necessitates a shift in course content to the fundamentals of classroom instruction.</p> | |
| <p>Demonstrate skills associated with the master's level in special education in the measurement of student achievement and adjustment of instruction for maximum impact on student achievement</p> | <p>Data will be collected in CSP 545, <i>Curriculum Based Assessment</i>, and in field based methods classes (CSP 643, 686, 547, and 647). In each class, candidates are required to assess students; plan instruction based on the assessment; measure outcomes of instruction; and adjust instruction based on evaluation of outcomes. Data will be collected from lesson plans and reflections. Each will be evaluated with a rubric. Methods instructors will evaluate trends from submitted lesson plans and structured observations.</p> | <p>Methods instructors reported inconsistent application of assessment in lesson plans. Cooperating teachers in the field are less rigorous in daily assessment and do not monitor this as closely as they do other elements of teaching. The curriculum committee members are committed to the idea that novice teachers must assess daily to ensure outcomes. For several years, candidates have reported that field supervisors do not engage in daily assessment of specific skills, nor do they assess individual lesson plans.</p> | <p>Field supervisors are conferencing about how to best improve practice. The committee suggested that university supervisors monitor these practices carefully and give frequent feedback.</p> |

| | | | |
|--|--|--|---|
| <p>Demonstrate the candidate's commitment to the special education profession and to lifelong learning by documenting participation in professional development activities</p> | <p>Data will be collected in CSP 547 and CSP 647, each of which has professional development as a course requirement. In each course, candidates will be required to document the number of hours spent and types of experiences engaged in for professional development, reflecting upon experiences. Candidates are required to set professional goals and track progress toward these goals. Instructors will report to the curriculum committee on the variety and quality of professional development activities.</p> | <p>Methods instructors reported an increase in the number and kinds of professional development activities students/candidates engaged in. The committee noted that this trend is a result of instructors proactively seeking opportunities and making these known to the candidates. In previous years, professional development activities tended to be limited to club meetings and professional development available on campus. This year, in addition to local options, professional development activities included a national conference and two special events in the disability community in Greenville.</p> | <p>Instructors continue to seek opportunities to provide a variety of professional experiences.</p> |
|--|--|--|---|

*The following titles are provided for referenced courses.

- CSP 545 - Special Education Assessment
- CSP 547 - Internship in Special Education
- CSP 643 - Programming for Individuals with Mild/Moderate Exceptional Learning Needs
- CSP 647 - Practicum in Special Education
- CSP 686 - Education of Individuals with Mild/Moderate Exceptional Learning Needs

II. Division/Department Goals for the Current Year:

A. Goal # 1

Comprehensive assessment systems will be developed and Phase I implementation completed for all programs in the

Division of Teacher Education, allowing faculty to assess candidates' performance on common key assessments and utilize data to make program revisions, thus ensuring that candidates are well-prepared for their respective teaching fields/responsibilities.

1. Institutional Goal(s) Supported by this Goal:

SP #1; QEP #s 2, 4

2. Evaluation Procedure(s):

Individual programs within the Division of Teacher Education were responsible for developing comprehensive assessment systems that satisfied guidelines established by their respective professional organizations, as well as the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) Standards. Program coordinators met with the Division Chair on an individual basis to review the assessment systems and provided progress reports throughout the year.

3. Actual Results of Evaluation:

The final phase of the evaluation will be a review of data to be aggregated for assessments within each program. Data will be available in June 2006.

4. Use of Evaluation Results:

Ongoing analyses of the various assessment programs has afforded program planners opportunities to adjust assessments throughout the year based on data and feedback. Curriculum revisions have been made to target areas of weakness throughout programs as identified by assessments (e.g., infusing teacher work sample methodology into courses across the elementary education degree program). Students have benefited from receiving scoring rubrics that clearly delineate program expectations. An ensuing goal for 2006-2007 is the full implementation of the assessment system for each program.

B. Goal # 2

Coordinators/faculty for all programs within the Division of Teacher Education will implement specific measures to improve counseling/mentoring services within respective programs: the Seamless Articulation for Elementary Education (SAFE) and the Master of Arts in Teaching (MAT) programs will provide counseling and mentoring to candidates in these nontraditional programs through the cohort concept, tracking candidate progress toward program goals; advanced programs in elementary and special education will develop graduate handbooks and institute orientations to these guides; undergraduate degree programs in elementary and special education will improve existing advisement and feedback loops, as well as dissemination of program information through general information meetings.

1. Institutional Goal(s) Supported by this Goal:

SP #s 1, 2, 5; QEP # 1

2. Evaluation Procedure(s):

Program coordinators submitted status reports on a regular basis and met weekly with the Division Chair to discuss program/student concerns. Course evaluations completed by students provided information about students' perceptions related to their progress in individual courses. Exit surveys completed by student teachers and various other surveys/informal feedback methods provided information on students' perceptions of the services they received from faculty regarding advisement/counseling/mentoring.

3. Actual Results of Evaluation:

The attrition rate for the *SAFE* program has been reduced. A review of grade distributions and course evaluations indicated that some adjunct instructors in the *SAFE* program may not hold the same expectations of candidates as those of full-time faculty members. Recruiting efforts have yielded an increase in enrollment in the *SAFE* program; however, enrollment is still low, and the cohort concept is difficult to manage because a significant number of the students fail to meet requirements for advancement in the program, thereby lagging behind.

During its inception year, 16 of 17 *MAT* candidates persisted in the program. Feedback from interns revealed that University supervisors delivered uneven services during the internship, and that mentoring at the internship site was often sketchy.

Candidates in advanced programs in elementary education and special education received graduate handbooks which were explained to them by faculty. Sign-off sheets in folders indicate those students who received the handbooks.

Overall, feedback from students and alumni indicated that advisement services in the undergraduate programs served students well. Feedback did indicate, however, that students felt insecure about their abilities to practice inclusion and the application of related legal guidelines. A disposition assessment system was implemented, with a flag system maintained in each student's folder documenting progress toward the demonstration of dispositions associated with successful teaching.

4. Use of Evaluation Results:

Regular meetings with program coordinators have resulted in timely decisions affecting their respective programs. Faculty support/training was provided to ensure that all faculty members are responsive to the unique needs of candidates in their respective programs.

Increased efforts were made to seek qualified adjunct faculty and have them meet with Dr. Levenia Barnes, *SAFE* Coordinator, to review course content, syllabi, and related expectations. Full-time faculty members were recruited to teach key courses in an effort to maintain the integrity of the program and to coordinate the collection of assessment data.

During its inception year, 16 or 17 *MAT* candidates persisted in the program. Plans have been made to address mentor qualifications for mentors in host schools. More specific assessment guidelines have been developed for measuring candidate progress in the field, improving supervision practices. In addition, more detailed guidelines will be

provided for supervisors in the coming year.

Elementary and special education faculty provided a series of seminars for student teachers to address concerns related to inclusive practices. In addition, study has begun to determine ways that the content of the special education survey course (CSP 340) could be made more meaningful to students. Disposition ratings were reviewed by undergraduate program faculty and conferences held with students related to dispositions. Improvement plans have been identified for students in an effort to help them develop professional behaviors.

Overall, University services have been made more amenable to candidates in non-traditional programs as needs have been identified. Program coordinators have worked closely with University personnel to offer services to off-campus students similar to those available to on-campus students (e.g., obtaining Okra cards, registration, inclusion of pictures in yearbook).

A. Goal # 3

Division faculty will increase recruitment services through improved communication with Delta State University's recruiting office and personnel at community colleges, outreach visits, and the hosting of on-campus visits by prospective students, as well as through mail outs and the publication of a newsletter.

1. Institutional Goal Supported by this Goal:

SP # 2; QEP # 1

2. Evaluation Procedure(s)

Program planners tracked enrollment figures [see related note in Section 3]. Informal feedback from community college advisors and Delta State University recruitment personnel was considered in determining the effectiveness of recruitment efforts.

3. Actual Results of Evaluation

Visits were made to Jones Community College (JCC), Northwest Community College (NWCC), and to Hinds Community College (HCC). In addition, a planning meeting with administrators and program directors at Mississippi Delta Community College (MDCC) was held. Feedback from remote community colleges indicated that interest in attending Delta State University was weak when compared to interest in universities in closer proximity. In informal conversations with prospective students, there appeared to be a strong interest in online/nontraditional offerings. MDCC program planners identified Delta State University as the strongest choice among students when considering where to continue their teacher preparation training. Based on conversations with advisors/recruiters collectively, the Division's reputation for outstanding teacher preparation programs appears to be intact.

Response to on-site visitation by transfer/freshman students was moderate.

Summer 2006 transfer orientation numbers will be compared to those of summer 2005. Fall 2006 enrollment will be compared to the previous year's enrollment when available.

4. Use of Evaluation Results

There is a strong need to close the recruitment loop in terms of university recruiting, communication with community college advisors, and program planners within the Division. This will be articulated in a goal for the coming year. Enrollment records, when they become available, will serve as one indication of the effectiveness of recruitment efforts. The Division Chair and faculty will use anecdotal data in making program decisions that will render the Division's programs viable to a broader cross-section of students.

B. Goal #4

Each faculty member in the Division of Teacher Education will increase emphasis on scholarship, and in turn reflect current scientific understanding as it relates to best practice in education, through action research, scholarly publications, scholarly presentations, or other mediums appropriately focusing on scholarship, engaging students in the process as appropriate.

1. Institutional Goal Supported by this Goal:

SP # 1; QEP #s 1, 4

2. Evaluation Procedure(s):

The Division Chair met with each faculty member at the beginning of the academic year and reviewed each member's goal(s) with respect to scholarship, helping faculty to identify avenues for accomplishing the same. Periodic updates on progress toward goals were provided by faculty members. A year-end review of goals with faculty determined the degree to which they were successfully met.

3. Actual Results of Evaluation:

Each faculty member met or exceeded his or her goals with respect to scholarship. 100% of faculty in the Division made presentations at the international, national, regional, or state level, with several making multiple contributions.

4. Use of Evaluation Results:

The productivity of each faculty member within the Division was shared among faculty in an effort to identify ways to network and increase collaboration.

C. Goal #5

A comprehensive review of the curriculum for each program will be conducted by faculty study groups in light of National Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) Standards, professional association standards, Mississippi Department of Education (MDE) guidelines, Mississippi Institution of Higher Learning (IHL) guidelines, and current scientific research.

Council for

1. Institutional Goal Supported by this Goal:

SP # 1; QEP #s 1, 3, 4

2. Evaluation Procedure(s):

The Division Chair met with all program planners to facilitate the faculty study process and review work. The Division of Teacher Education Curriculum Committee and Teacher Education Council reviewed and approved Curriculum.

Revisions, as well as the College of Education Administrative Council (CEAC) and the Delta State University Academic Council.

3. Actual Results of Evaluation:

A recommendation was made to delete the undergraduate degree program in special education due to low enrollment and changes in federal legislation relevant to the program. A recommendation was made to identify a prescribed sequence of for the master's degree in elementary education in order to ensure rigor and allow for a cohesive assessment system. The number of hours in the program would change from 33 to 30 – 36 (with candidates allowed to count 6 hours of electives in addition to the prescribed course work if they desire).

A recommendation was made to eliminate the computer applications elective in the undergraduate elementary education program (with Technology Exam/tutorials sufficing) and require a diagnostics and remediation course in reading (to provide a stronger reading education emphasis in the program).

Extensive revisions were proposed to special education courses and other isolated courses across programs.

Recommendations were made to add components to all syllabi clarifying diversity, technology, and cheating/plagiarism statements; revise graduate level syllabi; and develop course notebooks for all courses within the Division.

4. Use of Evaluation Results:

All recommendations were approved and acted upon.

D. Goal #6

Phase One implementation of TaskStream, a web-based folio/data management system adopted by the College of Education, will occur, with emphasis on selective course data/management during its maiden year.

1. Institutional Goal Supported by this Goal:

SP # 3; QEP # 2

2. Evaluation Procedure(s):

Progress toward this goal was noted by faculty during faculty meetings/retreats and by the Division Chair through review of *TaskStream* summary reports and reports from faculty/program coordinators.

3. Actual Results of Evaluation:

Faculty and program coordinators recommended numerous changes to scoring/evaluative/reporting procedures across the Division as work ensued with *TaskStream*.

4. Use of Evaluation Results:

Faculty and the Division Chair worked closely with Richard Coughlin and Barrie Todd in the Technology Lab to continuously review and revise assessments and formats for data collection in an effort to systematize the use of *TaskStream*. Phase One was successfully completed, though full implementation of *TaskStream* remains a challenge and will represent a major Division goal for 2006-2007.

G. Goal #7

The Division of Teacher Education will continue partnerships within the local, regional, and broad educational community, as well as identify new initiatives for building coalitions aimed at improving P-12 educational systems within the region.

1. Institutional Goal Supported by this Goal:

SP #s 4, 5; QEP # 4

2. Evaluation Procedure(s):

Task forces within the Division of Teacher Education reported progress to the Division Chair. Informal feedback was obtained from participants in each endeavor.

3. Actual Results of Evaluation:

Reading education faculty recommended that students in the elementary education program be involved in providing service to the community through the *Born to Read* literacy program for toddlers, co-coordinated with the staff in the Instructional Resources Center (IRC) within the Delta State Roberts-LaForge Library. Students practiced skills learned in reading education courses while providing these services.

Reading education faculty and the Division Chair proposed a Literacy Enhancement Lab, identifying the premises and components of the lab.

The Conference Task Force identified a need to provide continuing education to regional educators in the area of

providing educational services to English Language Learners (ELL), proposing to host a training/conference in fall 2006.

University, College, and Division administrators met with administrators and program planners from Mississippi Delta Community College (MDCC) in an effort to provide a more seamless articulation between elementary education programs at the two institutions, especially with respect to the Seamless Articulation for Elementary Education (SAFE) program offered through the Division, and in partnership with MDCC, at the Greenville Higher Education Center.

4. Use of Evaluation Results

Students in CML 332, *Children's Literature*, successfully conducted the *Born to Read* program in the IRC under the guidance of Ms. Frieda Quon, IRC Librarian, and Dr. Sandy Rakes, CML 332 instructor.

A proposal has been submitted for funding the Literacy Enhancement Lab. Program planners expect a response in June regarding the status of funding. A goal for implementation will be cited for 2006-2007.

Faculty have received training in best practice for ELL, and have suggested possible dates for a fall training for regional educators related to these practices, to be hosted by the Division of Teacher Education, College of Education.

A new articulation agreement has been written to clearly define the respective roles of MDCC and the Division of Teacher Education within the College of Education in an effort to better serve students in education programs at both institutions.

H. Goal #8

Student professional organizations (Mississippi Professional Educators (MPE); Council for Exceptional Children (CEC); Mississippi Association for Middle Level Education (MAMLE); Delta Reading Council (DRC); and Mississippi Early Childhood Association (MECA) will serve as vehicles to provide more civic-based opportunities to teacher candidates, increasing their understanding of the foundations of education.

1. Institutional Goal(s) Supported by this Goal:

SP # 1, 5; QEP #s 1, 2, 4

2. Evaluation Procedures:

Faculty and the Division Chair monitored programs offered through these organizations to ensure that speakers and programs met the spirit of the goal. A weakness of evaluation was the failure to have students provide feedback on speakers and the lack of evidence to show how instructors incorporated information from the meetings within classes.

3. Evaluation Results:

Two programs were offered during the year which were civic-based, one dealing with opportunities for multi-cultural teaching (sponsored by MPE) and the other focusing on the perspectives of local industry and the Chamber of Commerce

with respect to the health of the public school system. Faculty and the Division Chair deemed both of merit to students. In the future, additional evaluative data will be collected as noted above.

4. Use of Evaluation Results:

Faculty determined it worthwhile to have representation from the Chamber of Commerce/local industry to speak to students annually. Plans are to expand the session and include a panel of guests from the community next year. Based on the level of satisfaction with current year programs, faculty have committed to meet prior to the 2006-2007 school year to pinpoint other civic-based topics to address in the coming year.

V. Data and information for department:

The following tables provide data for the Division of Teacher Education.

Table 1: Enrollment by Major

Table 2: Graduates by Major

Table 3: Credit Hour Production by Discipline

Table 4: Comparison of Enrollment by Major

Table 1

| ENROLLMENT BY MAJOR | | | | | | |
|-----------------------------------|--------------------|------------|------------------|------------|--------------------|------------|
| | Summer 2005 | | Fall 2005 | | Spring 2006 | |
| | UG | GR | UG | GR | UG | GR |
| Elementary Education | 110 | 61 | 317 | 67 | 269 | 72 |
| Master of Arts in Teaching | - | 17 | - | 17 | - | 16 |
| Special Education | 15 | 37 | 33 | 53 | 27 | 54 |
| Subtotal | 125 | 115 | 350 | 137 | 296 | 142 |
| Total | 125 | 115 | 350 | 137 | 296 | 142 |

Table 2

GRADUATES BY MAJOR

| Major | December 2005 | May 2006 |
|---------------------------------------|---------------|-----------|
| Elementary Education, Undergraduate | 24 | 34 |
| Elementary Education, Master's | 26 | 10 |
| Elementary Education, Ed.S. | 7 | 2 |
| Master of Arts in Teaching | 0 | 0 |
| Special Education, Graduate, Master's | 8 | 4 |
| Total | 65 | 50 |

Table 3

| CREDIT HOUR PRODUCTION BY DISCIPLINE | | | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|------------|
| Discipline | Summer 2005 | | Fall 2005 | | Spring 2006 | |
| | UG | GR | UG | GR | UG | GR |
| CEL | 174 | 351 | 1287 | 225 | 1176 | 183 |
| CML | 51 | 42 | 123 | 48 | 75 | 51 |
| CRD | 153 | 36 | 321 | 0 | 204 | 102 |
| CSD | 0 | 51 | 0 | 450 | 0 | 0 |
| CSP | 414 | 345 | 618 | 231 | 582 | 339 |
| CUR | 0 | 678 | 529 | 297 | 449 | 201 |
| Total | 792 | 1503 | 2878 | 1251 | 2486 | 876 |

Table 4

A COMPARISON OF 2004-05 AND 2005-06 ENROLLMENT BY MAJOR

| | '04 | '04 | '05 | '05 | '05 | '06 |
|---------------------------|--------|------|--------|--------|------|--------|
| | Summer | Fall | Spring | Summer | Fall | Spring |
| Elementary Education (UG) | 117 | 318 | 263 | 110 | 317 | 269 |

| | | | | | | |
|-----------------------------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|
| Elementary Education (GR) | 65 | 82 | 93 | 61 | 67 | 72 |
| Master of Arts in Teaching | - | - | - | 16 | 16 | 16 |
| Special Education (UG) | 8 | 25 | 29 | 15 | 33 | 27 |
| Special Education (GR) | 27 | 40 | 40 | 37 | 53 | 54 |
| Totals | 218 | 465 | 425 | 239 | 486 | 438 |

V. Personnel:

A. Faculty for the Division, 2005-2006:

Full time:

Dr. Levenia Maxwell-Barnes, *Elementary Education*
 Dr. Beth Coghlan, *Elementary/Secondary Education*
 Dr. Cheryl Cummins, *Elementary Education*
 Dr. Joe Garrison, *Elementary Education*
 Dr. Leslie Griffin, *Elementary Education*
 Dr. Vicki Hartley, *Special Education*
 Dr. Maud Kuykendall, *Special Education*
 Ms. Elaine Lambert, *Special Education*
 Dr. Sandy Rakes, *Elementary Education*
 Ms. Lillie Smith, *Elementary/Secondary Education*
 Ms. Corlis Snow, *Elementary Education*

Staff:

Ms. Camesha Benson, *Senior Secretary for the Division*

Summary:

10 full-time faculty
 1 administrator, (1/2 teaching)
 1 staff, secretary

Adjunct Faculty for 2005-2006

| Summer 2005 | Fall 2005 | Spring 2006 |
|--------------------|---------------------|---------------------|
| Dorothy Prestwich | Betsy Alexander | Betsy Alexander |
| Dianne Thomas | Jane Barr | Jane Barr |
| | Janie Allen-Bradley | Janie Allen-Bradley |
| | Gail Cheney | Gail Cheney |
| | Oma Davis | Oma Davis |

| | | |
|--|--------------------|--------------------|
| | James Nicholson | James Nicholson |
| | Dorothy Prestwich | Dorothy Prestwich |
| | Linda Russell (2) | Linda Russell (2) |
| | James Smith | James Smith |
| | James Strawbridge | James Strawbridge |
| | Amy Tarver | Amy Tarver |
| | Helen Thornton (2) | Helen Thornton (2) |

Review of Noteworthy Activities and Accomplishments for 2005-2006

The commitment of faculty in the Division of Teacher Education rendered the year extremely rewarding in terms of curriculum development/revision, comprehensive program assessment, data-driven decision making, and the implementation of technology. While engaged in intensive curriculum and assessment work requiring the development of measurement instruments, course materials, and complex data management systems, the faculty were unwavering in their commitment to teaching while fulfilling myriad services to the College of Education, Delta State University, and the region. They ensured that the integrity of courses within each program remained intact, and that innovative approaches were infused. The breadth and depth of the body of work achieved this past year cannot be captured on paper.

1. Teaching

Professional Growth and Development

- Held numerous **retreats** to plan and develop program assessments consistent with National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) Standards
- Attended the following **training** and **informational sessions** related to teaching practices:
 - **Virginia Summit on Interdisciplinary Teacher Preparation**, sponsored by Virginia Dept. of Education/U.S. Dept. of Education, Norfolk, VA (Griffin and Lambert)
 - **NCATE Training by Margie Crutchfield**, sponsored by Jackson State University, Jackson, MS (Griffin, Smith)
 - **Special Education Licensure by Dr. Melody Bounds**, sponsored by Miss. Dept. of Education, Delta State University (Kuykendall, Lambert, Griffin)
 - **English Language Learners Training**, sponsored by DeSoto County School District, Hernando, MS (Snow, Hartley, Lambert, Cummins, Barnes)
 - **Fluency Development by Elfreida Hiebert**, sponsored by Miss. Dept. of Education, Hattiesburg, MS (Thomas, adjunct)
 - **NCATE Training by Antoinette Mitchell**, sponsored by The University of Mississippi, Oxford, MS (Griffin)
 - **Kay Faigler Children's Book Festival**, sponsored by The University of Southern Mississippi, Hattiesburg, MS (Rakes)
 - **Orientation for Dissertation Chairs and Committee Members**, sponsored by the College of Education (Cummins, Garrison, Griffin, Rakes)
 - **Teaching Professors' Conference**, Nashville, TN (Lambert)

- **Effective Instructional Practices for English Language Learners**, sponsored by Reading First Grant, Atlanta, GA (Griffin)

Curriculum, Program Review and Development, Program Support

- Engaged in training and planning sessions to facilitate the **implementation of *TaskStream***, the College of Education's electronic portfolio/data management system
- Developed **comprehensive assessment systems** for all programs, requiring faculty to align identified assessments with national standards (those of respective professional organizations and NCATE), design assessment instruments and scoring guides, and coordinate and deliver training sessions to teacher candidates
- Implemented ***Renaissance Teacher Work Sample Methodology*** in elementary education degree programs to assess teacher candidates' impact on student learning in the P-12 school setting
- **Critically reviewed all programs** in light of *No Child Left Behind* legislation, Mississippi Institution of Higher Learning (IHL) mandates, national and state standards, articulation agreements with community colleges, and assessment data, resulting in the phasing out of the special education undergraduate degree program; major revisions to the elementary undergraduate and advanced programs; and across-the-board revisions to courses within programs
- **Updated undergraduate course syllabi, revised advanced program syllabi, and developed course notebooks** containing all course materials, including assessment range products
- Successfully completed the initial year of the **Master of Arts in Teaching (MAT) Program**, further developing syllabi, course materials, procedural guidelines, and assessments for the program
- Served as primary author of **integrated arts syllabus** for **Whole Schools Grant** (Griffin)
- Offered **intersession courses** (CRD 325, *Teaching Reading in the Content Areas* (Barnes) and CSP 616, *Behavior Management* (Hartley)), as well as a range of elementary education courses in the SAFE program at GHEC
- Implemented **PowerPoint/web-based presentations** in classroom presentations utilizing teacher-made and publication resources (numerous classes)
- Coordinated and taught **GST courses** (Coghlan, Barnes)
- Coordinated numerous **field experiences** in diverse sites to expose candidates to best practices in teaching (all faculty)
- Taught **online courses** (CEL/CUR 611, *Classroom Management* and CSP 340, *Survey of Special Education* as online courses), with several others utilizing web-based components

2. Scholarship

Papers/Presentations/Publications

Coghlan, B., & Smith, L. (2005). *Preparing alternate-route educators to teach rural kids*. Paper presented at the National Rural Education Association (NREA) Annual Conference, Tucson, AZ.

Coghlan, B., & Hare, D. (2005). *The plight of outsiders: Rural teachers' resistance to outsiders in a rural school*.

Paper presented at the National Rural Education Association (NREA) Annual Conference, Tucson, AZ.

Cummins, C., & Griffin, L. (2005). *Literacy instruction through the small-group tutorial: A training manual for the Americorps literacy tutor*. Training manual prepared for Delta Reads Partnership and Mississippi Delta Service Corps, Delta State University.

Cummins, C., & Griffin, L. (2005). *Teacher work sample folios: A medium for improving practice in teacher education*. Presentation at the Teaching in Higher Education Faculty Development Conference, Delta State University.

Garrison, R. J., & Griffin, L. (2006). *Mathematics investigations on a rural Mississippi farm provide real-world link for students with exceptionalities*. Paper presented at the American Council of Rural Special Education (ACRES) Conference, Lexington, KY.

Griffin, L. (2006). *Differentiated instruction in the mixed ability classroom*. Presentation at Middle Level Essentials Conference, National Middle School Association (NMSA), Louisville, KY.

Griffin, L., & Barnes, L. (2006). *Literacy across the curriculum: An institute for grades 5-12*. Presentation at International Reading Association (IRA) Annual Conference, Chicago, IL.

Griffin, L., & Rakes, S. (2005). *Get them up and moving: Fifteen-minute interdisciplinary activities for the social and curious pre-adolescent*. Paper presented at the National Middle School Association (NMSA) Annual Conference, Philadelphia, PA.

Griffin, L., & Cummins, C. (2005). *Teacher work sample folios: Adapting teacher work sample methodology for existing educator preparation programs*. Paper presented at The Teaching Learning Conference, The Clute Institute, Las Vegas, NV.

Hartley, V. J., & Lambert, E. (2006). *Enhancing reflective practice: Targeted experiences and systematic feedback*. Presentation at the American Council of Rural Special Education (ACRES) Annual Conference, Lexington, KY.

Kuykendall, M. (2006). *Pre-service teachers' perceptions of inclusion in their host schools*. Presentation at the 25th Woodall Spring Conference for Helping Professions, Delta State University.

Kuykendall, M. (2006). *Roots and branches: Growing into inclusion*. Presentation at the American Council of Rural Special Education (ACRES) Annual Conference, Lexington, KY.

Kuykendall, M., Hartley, V., Lambert, E., & Griffin, L. (2006). *A graphic presentation of pre-service teachers' perceptions on inclusion*. Poster presentation at the 2nd Annual Delta State University Faculty Research and

Scholarship Symposium, Delta State University.

Lambert, E., & Hartley, V. J. (2006). *Multi-stage lesson planning: An ongoing challenge in a rural setting*. Presentation at the American Council of Rural Special Education (ACRES) Annual Conference, Lexington, KY.

Rakes, S., & Cummins, C. (2006). *The effect of think-aloud strategies on listening comprehension levels of Delta area second grade students*. Poster presentation at the 2nd Annual Delta State University Faculty research and Scholarship Symposium, Delta State University.

Snow, C. (2006). *Word power*. Presentation at the Mississippi Reading Association Annual Conference, Tunica, MS.

Snow, C. (2006). *Vocabulary development*. (2006). Presentation at the A-Z Early Childhood Conference, Delta State University.

Editorial Reviews

- *Assessment of Student Achievement* (8th ed.), Allyn & Bacon (Cummins)
- *Elementary Reading Methods*, Wiley Publications (Cummins)
- *Elementary Social Studies*, Wiley Publications (Rakes)
- *Teaching in the Middle School*, Merrill Publishing Company (Coghlan)
- Reviewer for proposal submissions to 2006 AREA Meeting in San Francisco, CA (Coghlan)

3. Service and Collaboration

- Received **IHL grant** (\$100,340.00) to offer *Literacy Across the Curriculum: Institute for Grades 5-12*, enabling area teachers to obtain *No Child Left Behind* highly qualified status
- Promoted **student engagement in professional organizations**, with students attending conferences, as well as making presentations (e.g., Mississippi Reading Association (Snow); American Council for Rural Special Education (Kuykendall))
- Served as **faculty senate** member, vice chair (2005-2006); currently serving as secretary (Cummins)
- Served on the Mississippi Department of Education **Higher Education Literacy Council** (Griffin, Snow, Cummins, Barnes)
- Collaborated with DSU library staff to coordinate and host **Born to Read** literacy program for toddlers (Rakes)
- Collaborated with MDE to host 2nd Congressional District Reading Fair (Griffin)
- Collaborated with *The Commercial Appeal* to sponsor Bolivar County Spelling Bee (Griffin)
- Served on **executive boards for professional associations** within the state
 - Mississippi Professional Educators (Barnes)
 - Mississippi Association for Middle Level Education (Barnes)
 - Mississippi Rural Education Association (Coghlan)
- **Advised and mentored Cohorts I, II, and III** of the **SAFE elementary education program** at GHEC
- **Advised** approximately **60 students** per faculty member in elementary education (**35** in special education)

- Served as **board member** for the St. Luke After School Neighborhood Program (Rakes, Cummins)
- Served as **judges** at 2nd Congressional District Reading Fair (all faculty)
- Served as coordinator/pronouncer/judges at **Bolivar County Spelling Bee** (Griffin/Garrison/Cummins/Snow)
- Served as pronouncer/judges at **Presbyterian Day School Spelling Bee** (Garrison/Griffin/Cummins)
- Sponsored **student trips** to **Mississippi Geographic Alliance Pre-Service Candidate Conference**, Raymond (Rakes); **Mississippi Association for Middle Level Education Annual Conference (MAMLE)**, Hattiesburg (Barnes); **American Council for Rural Special Education (ACRES)**, Kuykendall
- Coordinated and monitored teacher candidate **service learning project**, *Born to Read* (Rakes)
- Organized a **book drive** with the CML 332, *Children's Literature*, class to purchase books for the Pass Christian School District after Hurricane Katrina
- Served as **Coordinator** of St. Luke's Children's Ministry (Cummins)
- Served on the **Adult Basic Education Advisory Board** at MDCC (Barnes)
- Served as **Student Engagement Champion** and assisted in planning/coordinating **faculty development conferences** at Delta State University (Lambert)
- Provided **training session** on teaching techniques to Vernon Memorial Apostolic Church (Snow)
- Planned/directed **student teaching seminars** twice a semester for all student teachers on timely topics (all faculty)
- **Mentored** student teachers through **folio development process** during student teaching semester
- Served on panel for **Black History Month Program**, Ruleville High School (Smith)
- Served as delegate to **Civil Rights Conference**, Philadelphia, MS (Smith)

Technical Assistance/Professional Development Services Rendered to Area Schools

- *Charleston Public Schools: New Teacher Induction Workshop Series; Literacy Instruction Workshop Series* (Griffin)
- *Humphreys County School District: Comprehensive Evaluation of Even Start Family Literacy Program* (Griffin)
- *McEvans Elementary School, Shaw School District: Literacy Development Workshop* (Snow)
- *Indianola Middle School, Indianola School District: Differentiated Instruction Workshop* (Coghlan)

Affiliation with/Support of Professional Organizations, University, College, and Division Committees

Faculty members provide extensive service as sponsors, officers, and/or committee members in the following organizations. Additionally, they hold membership in many additional organizations.

National Rural Education Association
 Mississippi Rural Education Association
 Kappa Delta Pi
 Mississippi Department of Education Higher Education Literacy Council
 Girl Scouts of America
 Delta Kappa Gamma

Delta Reading Council
Mississippi Professional Educators
Mississippi Association for Middle Level Education
Mississippi Early Childhood Association
Student Council for Exceptional Children

Faculty members are highly involved in committee work at the University, College, and Division levels. During the past year, the Division had representation on each of the following:

University

Student Engagement Champions
Library Committee
Tenure and Appeals Committee
Courtesy Committee
Health and Wellness Committee
Safety and Environment Committee
Faculty Senate

College

All NCATE Standards Committees
Tenure/Promotion Committee
Doctoral Advisory Committee
Doctoral Dissertation Committees
Recruitment Task Force
Beautification Task Force

Division

Teacher Education Council
Curriculum Committee
NCATE Committees
Numerous ad hoc committees
Courtesy Committee

New position(s) requested, with justification:

No new positions have been created.

Recommended change of status:

Dr. Beth Coghlan resigned to relocate with her family.

Ms. Lillie Smith resigned to marry and relocate.

VI. Degree Program Addition/Deletions and/or Major Curriculum Changes:

Changes made in the past year:

Deletion of Undergraduate Degree Program in Special Education: The undergraduate degree program in special education (mild/moderate K-12) was deleted, with no new majors to be accepted in fall 2006. The program will be phased out by fall 2007 to allow majors currently in the program to complete their degrees. Enrollment in the undergraduate special education degree program has been stagnant for a number of years. Several factors have contributed to this stagnation, including changes in teacher licensure and changes in the role of special education teachers in the school. The Division will continue to respond to the high demand for special education teachers in the area through the graduate program in special education, which offers initial licensure, and through the opportunity for dual licensure in elementary and special education via completion of a special education endorsement.

Revision of Master's Degree Program in Elementary Education: The elementary education graduate degree program was streamlined, with a reduction in hours from 33 to 30 – 36 hours in the program, with 30 hours of specified coursework (in addition to prescribed coursework, 6 hours of electives may be counted in the degree program if candidates desire). Previously, candidates had much latitude in selecting electives. However, with the rigorous demands of the National Council of Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) with respect to assessment and learner outcomes, program planners felt it would strengthen the program to identify and sequence course content in a manner that would allow for a cohesive assessment system. Each course has been reviewed with respect to its content, and new syllabi are being developed for the courses.

Revisions to Undergraduate Degree Program in Elementary Education: The requirement of a **computer applications course** was deleted from the program for the following reasons: 1) the interdisciplinary program of study identified by the Mississippi Department of Education no longer identifies this course as part of its core, and 2) the College of Education now requires a Technology Examination, with follow-up tutorials for students lacking computer literacy skills. In order to strengthen the reading education component of the elementary education program, **CRD 326, *Diagnosis and Remediation of Reading Difficulties***, was made a required course in the program. The addition of this required course in reading will result in all teacher candidates having an endorsement in reading education that meets the expectations of *No Child Left Behind* legislation with respect to the highly qualified status of teachers. **PER 382, *Physical Education in the Elementary School***, was replaced by **PER 381, *Health and Physical Education for the Elementary School***, to meet accreditation requirements for an emphasis in health education.

Additionally, **course revisions** were made for the following: Special Education, CSP 340, 341, 342, 345, 346, 347, 348, 350, 351, 385, 386, 387, 500, 545, 546, 547, 550, 551, 583, 584, 585, 616, 640, 642, 643, 647, 649, 660, 667, 668, 669, 680, 681, 682, 686; and Elementary Education, CRD 624.

Recommended changes for the coming year(s)

II. Division/Department Goals for Coming Year:

This is a statement of goals for the **coming year**. These are operational goals for the unit that are NOT tied directly to student learning outcomes.

A. Goal # 1

Comprehensive program assessment plans will be fully implemented for each degree program within the Division of Teacher Education.

1. Institutional Goal(s) Supported by this Goal:

SP # 1; QEP #s 2, 4

2. Expected Results:

The National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) will indicate that the Division has met Standard 2 (Assessment) upon reviewing the programs during the College of Education's spring 2007 accreditation visit. Programs will become more responsive to learner outcomes, ultimately improving student performance and viability in P-12 school settings.

3. Evaluation Procedure(s):

Faculty study groups will review aggregated results of program assessments and make decisions affecting respective programs based on these results. Professional organizations will review the assessment plans submitted by individual programs within the Division and make decisions regarding whether corresponding standards have been met. NCATE will review these decisions, as well as the assessment designs, and make a decision regarding whether Standard 2 (Assessment) has been met.

4. Use of Evaluation Results:

Learner outcomes for each program will be provided in both quantitative and qualitative terms, allowing program planners to triangulate data and make informed decisions about programs at systematic intervals.

B. Goal # 2

The Division of Teacher Education will increase outreach efforts through the development of an enhanced website.

1. Institutional Goal(s) Supported by this Goal:

SP #s 2, 4, 5; QEP #2

2. Expected Results:

Prospective students will be able to access Division and program information through the enhanced website. Alumni and prospective students, as well as the broad community, will gain updates on Division news through electronic newsletters. Enrollment will increase a minimum of 5%.

3. Evaluation Procedure(s):

The Website Enhancement Task Force will meet regularly with the Division Chair to review progress. Feedback regarding the quality of services provided through the website will be solicited from students, alumni, and others accessing the site.

4. Use of Evaluation Results:

Evaluative information will be used to continually upgrade the website.

C. Goal #3

An operational system for managing assessment data across programs within the Division of Teacher Education will be systematized through the utilization of *TaskStream*, an electronic data management system, and other data management tools as designated by a faculty task force.

1. Institutional Goal(s) Supported by this Goal:

SP # 3; QEP # 2

2. Expected Results:

The use of *TaskStream* and other data management tools will become institutionalized. Results will be used annually, and in a systematic manner, to evaluate the effectiveness of programs.

3. Evaluation Procedure(s):

Progress toward this goal will be noted by faculty during faculty meetings/retreats and by the Division Chair through review of *TaskStream* summary reports from faculty/program coordinators.

4. Use of Evaluation Results:

Evaluation results will be considered in making decisions regarding the management system for assessment data.

D. Goal #4

Service to the immediate community will be expanded through the development of the Literacy Enhancement Clinic, where area P-12 students will have access to individualized literacy tutoring and a range of literacy experiences.

1. Institutional Goal(s) Supported by this Goal:

SP # 5; QEP #s 2, 3, 4

2. Expected Results:

Teacher education candidates will become more proficient in the use of appropriate literacy instruction methods. Students in area P-12 schools will show improvement in their application of literacy skills.

3. Evaluation Procedure(s):

Teacher education candidates will be assessed by course instructors via appropriate assessment guidelines for the tasks performed. Pre- and post-tests will be administered to students enrolled in the Literacy Lab. Informal feedback will be gathered from faculty, teacher candidates, and teachers/students in P-12 schools receiving services regarding the quality of services provided.

4. Use of Evaluation Results:

Assessment data related to teacher candidate performance will be used to improve course delivery and the training of candidates related to literacy education. Pre- and post-test data on performance of P-12 students receiving instruction in the Lab will also be used to assess and improve the reading education program, as well as provide opportunities for reflective practice among teacher candidates. Informal feedback from all sources will be used to improve all aspects of operations within the Literacy Lab.

E. Goal #5

The Division of Teacher Education will provide leadership within the broader educational community through involvement in statewide initiatives and the hosting of a training/conference targeting the enhancement of services to English language learners(ELLs).

1. Institutional Goal(s) Supported by this Goal:

SP #s 4, 5; QEP # 4

2. Expected Results:

Division faculty will provide support to statewide initiatives through involvement in the Higher Education Literacy Council and other Mississippi Department of Education projects/committees/task forces, which in turn will inform practice within the Division's programs. A training/conference for dissemination of best practices in the education of English Language Learners (ELL) will be hosted by the Division in fall 2006.

3. Evaluation Procedure(s):

The Division Chair will monitor involvement in initiatives, maintaining logs of all activities. Faculty will receive updates through faculty study groups/meetings and determine how best to infuse information into programs, reporting on results participants.

4. Use of Evaluation Results:

Feedback from faculty will guide program development relevant to broad initiatives. Feedback from the ELL training/conference will provide information that will be used in planning other such initiatives.

F. Goal #6

The faculty of the Division of Teacher Education will increase their productivity in areas of targeted weakness through collaboration with one another and professionals from the broader educational community.

1. Institutional Goal(s) Supported by this Goal:

SP # 3

2. Expected Results:

Each faculty member will review past performance, target an area of weakness in teaching, scholarship, or service, and develop a goal/related plan for addressing the weakness. Collaboration and support among faculty within the Division and the broader educational community will increase, with the resulting exchange of information/ideas strengthening programs within the Division.

3. Evaluation Procedure(s):

Goals will be established by each faculty member prior to the beginning of the academic year and reviewed in a conference with the Division Chair to determine their appropriateness and determine support needed to accomplish the goals. Progress toward goals will be reviewed throughout the year, and a final evaluation of goal attainment will be conducted at the conclusion of the year during faculty evaluation conferences (between faculty/Division Chair).

4. Use of Evaluation Results:

Evaluation results will be used to design measures to ensure that each faculty member continues to grow professionally. They will also be considered in promotion and tenure decisions for eligible faculty.

G. Goal #7

The Division of Teacher Education will promote increased undergraduate student involvement in professional organizations and service learning simultaneously through the alignment of course outcomes with professional/service learning experiences.

1. Institutional Goal(s) Supported by this Goal:

SP #1; QEP # 1

2. Expected Results:

All students in undergraduate education courses will be involved in a service learning project through a professional. The project will relate to course outcomes and align with course content within the program.

Appropriate rubrics/feedback checklists will be developed for the project(s). Informal feedback related to the usefulness of the experience will also be collected.

3. Evaluation Procedure(s)

A faculty committee will review results of both the faculty assessments and student feedback.

4. Use of Evaluation Results

Evaluation results will be studied and inform future planning for experiences of this nature.

